

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Derrick Waiters, # 18510-056,

Plaintiff,

VS.

NFN Phillip, Food Service Officer at FCI-Estill;
NFN Garica, Physicians Assistant at FCI-Estill;
NFN Ashline, Food Service Supervisor at
 FCI-Estill; and
NFN Vindell, Doctor at FCI-Estill,

Defendants.

C/A No. 6:06-2648-GRA-WMC

Report and Recommendation

Background of this Case

The plaintiff is a federal prisoner at FCI-Butner in North Carolina. He was formerly confined at FCI-Estill in Estill, South Carolina. He has brought suit against a Food Service Officer at FCI-Estill, the Food Service Supervisor, a physician's assistant, and a physician. The complaint is not on this court's Bivens action complaint form.

In the complaint, the plaintiff alleges that on March 29, 2006, Food Officer Phillip threw a hard-boiled egg at the plaintiff and hit plaintiff in the left eye. The injury to the eye left the plaintiff with blurred vision in that eye. The plaintiff also

alleges that he was denied immediate medical attention after the injury and that the defendants attempted to tamper with and destroy evidence.

On the first page of the complaint, the plaintiff discloses that he did *not* complete the Federal Bureau of Prisons' administrative remedy procedure. The plaintiff contends that he was obstructed at the time he needed to file a Form BP 11 because "officials did not provide him with the bp 9 response when they replied to his bp 10 so that he could attach it to his bp 11." The plaintiff also contends that, under the holding in McCarthy v. Madigan, 503 U.S. 140, 117 L.Ed.2d 291, 112 S.Ct. 1081, 1992 U.S. LEXIS® 1524 (1992), he is not required to exhaust remedies in this Bivens action because he is seeking only monetary relief. The plaintiff seeks damages of sixteen million eight hundred thousand dollars (\$16,800,000).

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review¹ has been conducted in light of the following precedents: Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 118 L.Ed.2d 340, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 1992 U.S. LEXIS® 2689 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324-325, 104 L.Ed.2d 338, 109 S.Ct.

¹Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (DSC), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

1827, 1989 U.S. LEXIS® 2231 (1989); Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction, 64 F.3d 951, 1995 U.S.App. LEXIS® 26108 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1177, 134 L.Ed.2d 219, 116 S.Ct. 1273, 1996 U.S. LEXIS® 1844 (1996); Todd v. Baskerville, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); Boyce v. Alizaduh, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979)(recognizing the district court's authority to conduct an initial screening of any *pro se* filing);² Loe v. Armistead, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*, Moffitt v. Loe, 446 U.S. 928 (1980); and Gordon v. Leeke, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, Leeke v. Gordon, 439 U.S. 970 (1978). The plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); and Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). See Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); and Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, the plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. Fine v. City of New York, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). Even under this less stringent standard, the complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which

²Boyce has been held by some authorities to have been abrogated in part, on other grounds, by Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)(insofar as Neitzke establishes that a complaint that fails to state a claim, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), does not by definition merit *sua sponte* dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)], as "frivolous").

set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. Weller v. Department of Social Services, 901 F.2d 387, 1990 U.S.App. LEXIS® 6120 (4th Cir. 1990).

On the first page of the complaint, the plaintiff acknowledges that this case is a Bivens action. In Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388, 397 (1971), the Supreme Court established a direct cause of action under the Constitution of the United States against federal officials for the violation of federal constitutional rights. "Bivens is the case establishing, as a general proposition, that victims of a constitutional violation perpetrated by a federal actor may sue the offender for damages in federal court despite the absence of explicit statutory authorization for such suits." Wright v. Park, 5 F.3d 586, 589 n. 4, 1993 U.S.App. LEXIS® 25129 (1st Cir. 1993), which *cites, inter alia*, Carlson v. Green, 446 U.S. 14, 18 (1980)(restating Bivens rule).

A Bivens claim is analogous to a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983: federal officials cannot be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because they do not act under color of *state* law. See Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 814-820 & n. 30 (1982). Harlow, which is often cited for the principle of the qualified immunity of state officials for acts within the scope of their employment, was brought against a federal official. In footnote 30 of the opinion in Harlow, the Supreme Court stated that Harlow was applicable to state officials sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In other words, case law involving § 1983 claims is applicable in Bivens actions and *vice versa*. See Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 128 L.Ed.2d 811, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 1994 U.S. LEXIS®

4274 (1994); Bolin v. Story, 225 F.3d 1234, 1241-1242, 2000 U.S.App. LEXIS® 22501 (11th Cir. 2000); and Campbell v. Civil Air Patrol, 131 F.Supp.2d 1303, 1310 n. 8, 2001 U.S.Dist. LEXIS® 2542 (M.D.Ala. 2001)(noting that, since courts have expanded the Bivens remedy, usually used for a Fourth Amendment violation, to allow direct action under First and Fifth Amendments, “the court shall refer interchangeably to cases” decided under both § 1983 and Bivens).

As earlier stated, on the first page of the complaint, the plaintiff discloses that he did not complete the Federal Bureau of Prisons’ administrative remedy procedure. The plaintiff contends that he was obstructed at the time he needed to file a Form BP 11 because “officials did not provide him with the bp 9 response when they replied to his bp 10 so that he could attach it to his bp 11.” The plaintiff also contends that, under the holding in McCarthy v. Madigan, 503 U.S. 140, 117 L.Ed.2d 291, 112 S.Ct. 1081, 1992 U.S. LEXIS® 1524 (1992), he is not required to exhaust remedies in this Bivens action because he is seeking only monetary relief. The plaintiff also notes: “The bp 8, 9 and 10 however were not denied but compensation was offered and thus Waiters files the instant complaint seeking only monetary [sic] relief.”

The plaintiff is obviously unaware that the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), which was enacted in April of 1996, superseded the holding in McCarthy v. Madigan. See, e.g., Sallee v. Joyner, 40 F.Supp.2d 766, 767-772, 1999 U.S.Dist. LEXIS® 3025 (E.D.Va., February 23, 1999)(PLRA applies to Bivens actions,

including Bivens actions seeking only monetary relief, and supersedes McCarthy v. Madigan by statute).

Since the plaintiff acknowledges that he did not complete the BOP grievance procedure, this case is subject to summary dismissal for failure to exhaust prison remedies. See 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), which was enacted as part of the Prison Litigation Reform Act; Porter v. Nussle, 534 U.S. 516, 152 L.E.2d 12, 122 S.Ct. 983, 2002 U.S. LEXIS® 1373 (2002); Booth v. Churner, 531 U.S. 956, 149 L.Ed.2d 958, 121 S.Ct. 1819, 2001 U.S. LEXIS® 3982 (2001)(unanimous decision: PLRA requires administrative exhaustion even if grievance procedure does not allow monetary damages and prisoner seeks only monetary damages, so long as grievance tribunal has authority to take some responsive action); and Higginbottom v. Carter, 223 F.3d 1259, 2000 U.S.App. LEXIS® 21087 (11th Cir. 2000).

The Administrative Procedures Act, which is codified at 5 U.S.C. § 554 *et seq.*, and at 5 U.S.C. § 701 *et seq.*, is *not* applicable to inmates of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. See 18 U.S.C. § 3625. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has established an administrative procedure whereby a federal inmate may seek review of complaints relating to any aspect of his or her confinement. See 28 C.F.R. § 542.10, which was cited in Williams v. O'Brien, 792 F.2d 986, 987, 1986 U.S.App. LEXIS® 25782 (10th Cir. 1986).

A federal prisoner must begin the process of administratively exhausting his administrative remedies by filing a Form BP-8 (the informal resolution process). If

the federal prisoner is not satisfied with the informal resolution, he or she must file a formal grievance with the Warden of his or her prison (using a Form BP-9). See 28 C.F.R. § 542.13(b); and Hernandez v. Steward, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 18076, 1996 WESTLAW® 707015 (D.Kan., November 27, 1996)(federal prisoners must exhaust prison remedies prior to bringing suit in a federal district court).³

³In Hernandez v. Steward, the United States District Court for the District of Kansas outlined the procedure for exhausting administrative remedies in the Federal Bureau of Prisons:

The case comes before the court on the government's motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Dk. 15), and the government's motion to grant its motion to dismiss as uncontested (Dk. 18). By minute order filed October 23, 1996, (Dk. 20), the court gave the plaintiff until November 15, 1996, to file a response in accordance with D. Kan. Rules 7.1 and 7.6. The court also cautioned the plaintiff that "[i]f a response is not timely filed, the court may consider and decide the defendants' motion to dismiss as an uncontested motion." (Dk. 20). The plaintiff has not filed a response within the time provided.

The defendants seek dismissal arguing the plaintiff has not exhausted the administrative remedies available to inmates confined in correctional facilities operated by the federal Bureau of Prisons. See 28 C.F.R. Part 542. The Prison Litigation Reform Act, signed into law on April 26, 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-132, amended 42 U.S.C. § 1997e making it mandatory that a prisoner exhaust his administrative remedies. [FN1] "No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

[FN1. The Prison Litigation Reform Act took effect three days before the plaintiff filed this action.]

In his complaint, the plaintiff declares under penalty of perjury that he exhausted his administrative remedies and that he "filed what they called informal remedy which is BP, 8, 9, and 10 and they never replaid (sic) to" him. (Dk. 2 p. 3). The plaintiff does not attach copies of any forms he says were "filed." The plaintiff's conclusory assertion is not enough to demonstrate exhaustion within the meaning of § 1997e(a).

Under the federal administrative remedy program, the inmate first must submit his "issue of concern informally to staff." 28 C.F.R. § 542.13. If the issue is not resolved informally, the inmate commences the three-tiered

(continued...)

(...continued)

administrative remedy procedure by filing a written administrative remedy request (BP-9) with the local institution's administrative staff (Warden). 28 C.F.R. § 542.14(a). If dissatisfied with the Warden's response, the inmate may file an appeal (BP-10) with the Regional Director. 28 C.F.R. § 542.15(a). If dissatisfied with the Regional Director's response, the inmate may file an appeal (BP-11) with the General Counsel. This is the final administrative appeal provided under the administrative remedy scheme. "An inmate has not fully exhausted his administrative remedies until he has appealed through all three levels." *Irwin v. Hawk*, 40 F.3d 347, 349 n.2 (11th Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 116 S. Ct. 112 (1995).

The declaration of Robert Bennett, the administrative remedy coordinator at the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, reveals that all available records of administrative remedy submissions for the plaintiff were searched and that none of the plaintiff's submissions pertained to the issues raised in the instant complaint. Bennett's declaration summarizes the plaintiff's nine different administrative remedy submissions and recounts that all but one of the submissions were rejected on procedural grounds pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 542.17. Bennett's declaration is supported by computer-generated reports from SENTRY, the computer-based system on which all inmate submissions are permanently recorded.

Other than the conclusory assertions in the plaintiff's complaint, there is nothing of record to demonstrate that he exhausted the available administrative remedies. The plaintiff's explanation of the steps he took towards exhaustion shows his efforts were incomplete. The plaintiff only refers to his filing of an "informal remedy." Though he lists several "BP" forms, he fails to mention an appeal (BP-11) to the General Counsel. As for his excuse that "they never" replied, the plaintiff was still obligated to pursue all levels of the administrative scheme. "If the inmate does not receive a response within the time allotted for reply, including extension, the inmate may consider the absence of a response to be a denial at that level." 28 C.F.R. § 542.18. Under these circumstances, the record is devoid of a factual basis for reasonably believing that the plaintiff fully exhausted the administrative remedies available to him under the federal prison system.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Dk. 15), and motion to grant its motion to dismiss as uncontested (Dk. 18) are granted, and the case is dismissed without prejudice due to the plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies before bringing this action.

Hernandez v. Steward, *supra*, at *1-*2.


When the Warden of the prison has issued a determination on a federal prisoner's formal grievance, only the first step of the formal administrative process will have been completed. If necessary, the prisoner must appeal the Warden's determination to the Regional Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and, if necessary, to the Office of General Counsel. 28 C.F.R. § 542.15. See *also Williams v. O'Brien*, *supra*, 792 F.2d at 987. The plaintiff "has no alternative but to comply" with these administrative procedures. *Williams v. O'Brien*, *supra*, 792 F.2d at 987. See *also* 28 C.F.R. §§ 542.10 through 542.16; and *cf. Martinez v. Roberts*, 804 F.2d 570, 571 (9th Cir. 1986)(federal prisoners are required to exhaust their federal administrative remedies prior to bringing a petition for habeas corpus relief in federal court). Indeed, in light of the plaintiff's failure to complete the final step of the BOP administrative remedy procedure, it is clear that he has not "properly exhausted" his BOP remedies. See *Woodford v. Ngo*, 165 L.Ed.2d 368, 126 S.Ct. 2378, 2006 U.S. LEXIS® 4891 (2006)(PLRA requires "proper exhaustion" of administrative remedies).⁴

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of

⁴In light of the recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in *Green v. Young*, 454 F.3d 405, 2006 U.S. App. LEXIS® 18685 (4th Cir. 2006)(dismissal under PLRA for failure to exhaust administrative remedies does not count as a "strike" for purposes of the "three strikes" rule), imposition of a "strike" is *not* appropriate in the above-captioned case.

process. See Denton v. Hernandez, *supra*; Neitzke v. Williams, *supra*; Haines v. Kerner, *supra*; Brown v. Briscoe, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 & n. * (4th Cir. 1993), *replacing* unpublished opinion originally tabled at 993 F.2d 1535 (4th Cir. 1993); Boyce v. Alizaduh, *supra*; Todd v. Baskerville, *supra*, 712 F.2d at 74; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)[essentially a redesignation of "old" 1915(d)]; and "new" 28 U.S.C. § 1915A[as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal]. The plaintiff's attention is directed to the very important Notice on the next page.



WILLIAM M. CATOE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

September 27, 2006
Greenville, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Magistrate Judge's "Report and Recommendation"

&

The Serious Consequences of a Failure to Do So

The plaintiff is hereby notified that any objections to the attached Report and Recommendation (or Order and Recommendation) must be filed within **ten (10) days** of the date of service. 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. A magistrate judge makes only a recommendation, and the authority to make a final determination in this case rests with the United States District Judge. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-271 (1976); and Estrada v. Witkowski, 816 F. Supp. 408, 410, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 3411 (D.S.C. 1993).

During the ten-day period for filing objections, **but not thereafter**, a party must file with the Clerk of Court specific, written objections to the Report and Recommendation, if he or she wishes the United States District Judge to consider any objections. **Any written objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** See Keeler v. Pea, 782 F. Supp. 42, 43-44, 1992 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 8250 (D.S.C. 1992); and Oliverson v. West Valley City, 875 F. Supp. 1465, 1467, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 776 (D.Utah 1995). Failure to file specific, written objections shall constitute a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the United States District Judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n. 4 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, Schronce v. United States, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); and Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-847 & nn. 1-3 (4th Cir. 1985). Moreover, if a party files specific objections to a portion of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, but does not file specific objections to other portions of the Report and Recommendation, that party waives appellate review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which he or she did not object. In other words, a party's failure to object to one issue in a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation precludes that party from subsequently raising that issue on appeal, even if objections are filed on other issues. Howard v. Secretary of HHS, 932 F.2d 505, 508-509, 1991 U.S. App. LEXIS® 8487 (6th Cir. 1991). See also Praylow v. Martin, 761 F.2d 179, 180 n. 1 (4th Cir.) (party precluded from raising on appeal factual issue to which it did not object in the district court), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1009 (1985). In Howard, *supra*, the Court stated that general, non-specific objections are *not* sufficient:

A general objection to the entirety of the [magistrate judge's] report has the same effects as would a failure to object. The district court's attention is not focused on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the [magistrate judge] useless. *** This duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act. We would hardly countenance an appellant's brief simply objecting to the district court's determination without explaining the source of the error.

Accord Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015, 1017-1019 (7th Cir. 1988), where the Court held that the appellant, who proceeded *pro se* in the district court, was barred from raising issues on appeal that he did not specifically raise in his objections to the district court:

Just as a complaint stating only 'I complain' states no claim, an objection stating only "I object" preserves no issue for review. *** A district judge should not have to guess what arguments an objecting party depends on when reviewing a [magistrate judge's] report.

See also Branch v. Martin, 886 F.2d 1043, 1046, 1989 U.S. App. LEXIS® 15,084 (8th Cir. 1989) ("no de novo review if objections are untimely or general"), which involved a *pro se* litigant; and Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 6 n. 1 (3rd Cir. 1984) (*per curiam*) ("plaintiff's objections lacked the specificity necessary to trigger *de novo* review"). **This notice, hereby, apprises the plaintiff of the consequences of a failure to file specific, written objections.** See Wright v. Collins, *supra*; and Small v. Secretary of HHS, 892 F.2d 15, 16, 1989 U.S. App. LEXIS® 19,302 (2nd Cir. 1989). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections addressed as follows:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603